

ceding. B. in the Tj. of Westminster, Middlesex, Ont., Mch. 31, 1840, he was ed. there and at the London Dist. Grammar Sch., and graduated LL.B. at Toronto Univ., 1872. He studied for his profession under the late Thos. Scatcherd, Q.C., M.P.; was called to the bar, 1861; and practised for some yrs. in partnership with Mr. Scatcherd, his former principal. It is recorded that as a pleader he possessed the analytical faculty to a most unusual degree, and that his great powers in cross-examination, combined with the convincing earnestness of his language, soon made him widely known among the mems. of the Ont. bar. He became city solicitor, and a Bencher of the Law Soc.; was made a Q.-C. by the Ont. Govt., 1875, and had the same honour conferred upon him by the Marquis of Lorne, 1880. In 1883 he was app'd. an hon. mem. of the Law Faculty of Toronto Univ. In the same year he moved to Toronto, and was subsequently app'd. Corporation Counsel there, and head of the city's legal dept. In 1889 he received from his *Alma Mater* the hon. degree of LL.D. During his professional career he was engaged in many important cases, both criminal and civil, including the mysterious Biddulph murder case and the McCabe poisoning case, in both of which he specially distinguished himself. Mr. M. was first elected to the Legislature, 1872, succeeding Mr. (now Sir) John Carling, who withdrew from Provl. politics, in the representation of London. He is said to have immediately become a power in the House. He took a firm stand on the side of the workingmen, and was one of the first advocates of manhood suffrage, which he took up in 1875. His name was also identified with the legislation by which wages to the amount of \$25 were exempted from seizure, with the Mechanics' Lien Act, with the Workingmen's Compensation for Injuries Act, with the question of Biennial Parli., and other measures

of a similar character. He was elected leader of the Opposition in 1878, succeeding the late Sir M. C. Cameron, who was raised to the bench, in that position. His promotion was long a foregone conclusion, as his colleagues had recognized his great strength in the country, and his accurate knowledge of political affairs. Not long after this event the boundary award was made, and the agitation which immediately arose rendered his task a difficult one. The discussion between the parties was a heated one, and it was endeavoured to cast upon Mr. M. the onus of having supported the claims of the Dom. as against those of the Province. He insisted, after the rejection of the award by the Dom. Parlt., that the question be submitted to the Privy Council, and the event ultimately proved his contention to have been correct, and the course he had proposed the only safe one that could have been taken. In the disallowance agitation of 1882, he again appeared to be on the unpopular side. He, however, did not hesitate to affirm the conviction that a strong central govt. was vitally necessary to a strong confederation, and to deprecate any efforts on the part of Provl. Govts. to weaken it for selfish ends. Throughout the reverses he met with at the polls, he never abandoned this principle. He also took strong ground (on the question of education. He enunciated the principle that to place a political head over the Education Dept. is to make it a political machine, and so greatly lessen its influence for good. During his last campaign he, on many occasions, expressed his views on this matter. He fought for a ballot in the Separate schs., and against the exercising of undue clerical influence, in educational matters. His newspaper discussion with Archbp. Cleary attracted wide attention, and to a great extent defined the line of cleavage between the parties. His opinions in this connection are too